

October 9, 2009

Ms. Kathleen O. Laffey
New Hampshire Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
19 Chenell Drive, Suite One
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

RE: EPA Comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and
Reevaluation/Section 4(f) Evaluation for the Interstate 93 Improvements Hillsborough
and Rockingham Counties, New Hampshire (CEQ# 20090278)

Dear Ms. Laffey:

The Environmental Protection Agency-New England Region (EPA) has reviewed the New Hampshire Department of Transportation's (NHDOT)/Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) and Reevaluation/Section 4(f) Evaluation for the Interstate 93 (I-93) Improvements Hillsborough and Rockingham Counties, New Hampshire. We submit the following comments on the DSEIS in accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The DSEIS describes the proposed widening of I-93 from two lanes in each direction to four lanes over a 19.8-mile segment from the Massachusetts/New Hampshire boundary to the I-93/I-293 interchange in Manchester, New Hampshire. The project also includes park-and-ride facilities, bus service, and ride-sharing between the project area and Massachusetts. EPA's comments on the 2002 I-93 DEIS expressed environmental objections to significant impacts to the aquatic environment which we suggested should be addressed through additional analyses, mitigation, and other commitments in the FEIS. Specifically, EPA recommended that risks to surface and ground waters from road salt and air quality impacts be addressed in greater detail, that mitigation plans should also be enhanced, and more information provided regarding commuter bus and high occupancy vehicle services in the project plans. Our comments on the 2004 FEIS noted continuing environmental concerns about impacts to wetlands, water quality, and air quality as well as indirect and cumulative impacts.

The DSEIS was prepared in response to a U.S. District Court decision in August, 2007 that required NHDOT/FHWA to prepare a SEIS "...that specifically considers how the Delphi Panel population forecasts affect Defendants' analysis of both the effectiveness of the Four Lane Alternative as a traffic congestion reduction measure and the indirect

effects of the additional population predicted by those forecasts on secondary road traffic and air quality issues.” The DSEIS was also prepared as a reevaluation under NEPA to address changes in the project from “design refinements, changes in existing conditions, changes in the relevant environmental regulations or laws, changes in mitigation measures or other environmental commitments and changes in analysis methods and potential impacts based on the Court order.” The reevaluation also serves as a means to determine whether additional issues beyond the court order warrant further consideration in the SDEIS given the time that passed since the publication of the FEIS in 2004. We support FHWA’s and NHDOT’s decision to combine the reevaluation with the SEIS required by the court order.

Based on our review of the DSEIS we have identified comments and concerns that we believe should be addressed in the FEIS related to alternatives, wetlands, water resources, greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, indirect effects and general project coordination. Based on our review of the DSEIS/Reevaluation we have rated the DSEIS “EC-2—Environmental Concerns-Insufficient Information” in accordance with EPA’s national rating system, a description of which is attached to this letter. Please contact Timothy Timmermann (617-918-1025) of EPA’s Office of Environmental Review with any comments or questions about this letter.

Sincerely,

/s/

Ira W. Leighton
Acting Regional Administrator

Attachment

cc: Colonel Philip T. Feir, Commander, New England District, Corps of Engineers

Summary of Rating Definitions and Follow-up Action

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO--Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC--Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EO--Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU--Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1--Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2--Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3--Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

**EPA Comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and
Reevaluation/Section 4(f) Evaluation for the Interstate 93 Improvements
Hillsborough and Rockingham Counties, New Hampshire (CEQ# 20090278)**

Alternatives

We believe the traffic analysis for the reevaluation should have compared the ability of both three and four lane widening alternatives to meet the project purpose and should compare how well the three and four lane alternatives provide the needed highway capacity. The DSEIS contains new population projections that have been revised downward since the 2004 FEIS. A new look at how the three lane alternative performs is reasonable given these projections. New information provided in the DSEIS calls into question the Army Corps of Engineers' (ACOE) December 2003 determination that a four lane alternative is the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) for this project. Reduced population growth, lower travel demand, water quality issues, and newly identified wetlands impacts all point to the need to reaffirm that a four lane alternative, rather than a three lane alternative, is in fact the LEDPA.

We also note that a three lane alternative would result in a significant reduction in the need for road salt use in watersheds that now have impaired water bodies due to chloride concentrations that exceed New Hampshire water quality standards. The June 2005 Record of Decision (ROD) for this project recognizes the importance of reducing salt usage/chloride loadings (section 1.3) so as not to cause or contribute to water quality violations. The May 2006 Section 401 Water Quality Certification for this project is conditioned (E-10) on the activity not contributing additional chloride loads, beyond those based on existing road salt management practices, to chloride-impaired surface waters. The three lane alternative would help meet this condition. It has also been shown (Implementation Plan to Increase the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Road Salt Use to Meet Total Maximum Daily Load for Chloride in Water Bodies Along the I-93 Corridor from Salem to Manchester, NH DOT, September 2009) that the TMDL allocation of salt for use on state roads, including the proposed highway, will be very difficult to achieve without significant reductions in the allowable allocations for other users, including municipalities, in the affected watersheds. The reduced salt usage from a three lane alternative would help in solving this problem as well.

Wetlands

The DSEIS documents that direct wetland impacts will be 11 percent greater than what was predicted in the FEIS in 2004, now 85 acres instead of 77. According to the DSEIS, this 8 acre increase is due primarily to more detailed wetland mapping and to final design analysis. The DSEIS states that because only parts of the final design details are complete for the highway expansion the additional 8 acre impact represents a more refined number, but not a final tabulation of total direct wetland impact.

Because of this substantial increase in wetland impacts EPA will recommend that the Corps of Engineers amend the 404 permit and require mitigation for these additional

impacts. We encourage the use of In-Lieu-Fee (ILF) as the best and most timely way to mitigate for these impacts. As we stated in our comments on the DEIS and FEIS, the bulk of the mitigation sites that NHDOT selected in 2004 are small, near development, and isolated from other protected lands and most are therefore not sustainable in the long-term. We have a great deal of confidence that the ILF program will find sustainable mitigation sites. In addition, we note that in the new federal Mitigation Rule, it recommends the use of the ILF program over permittee-responsible mitigation. Further, if the additional 8 acre impact becomes a 10 acre impact in the end, an additional payment would be an easy adjustment.

The DSEIS also reports that by more detailed analysis and modeling, the proposed floodplain impacts have decreased from 49.7 acre-feet to 19.8 acre-feet. Because of this decrease the DSEIS (page 10-22) states that NHDOT and FHWA plan to eliminate much of the proposed flood storage mitigation proposed originally in the FEIS. It also states that most of these sites are undeveloped wooded parcels, and creating flood storage would result in wildlife impacts from the extensive tree removal and earthwork. Many of these sites are also small parcels located near heavily developed areas including the highway. We support NHDOT's efforts to remove these flood storage sites from the mitigation plan as appropriate (where flood storage is no longer needed).

However, the DSEIS (page 10-24) states that the mitigation plan will create 24 acres of wetlands and these numbers are also listed in Appendix F. These numbers do not appear to be accurate. We are aware of 12 acres of wetland creation (South Road and Pelham Road), but the remainder of the areas listed as wetland creation appear to be flood storage areas, and as explained above, many of which we agree should be removed. Even for those sites that remain, most are wooded, somewhat isolated sites. Cutting all the trees down and making a large detention area may provide functional flood storage, but the clearing will reduce other functions and the creation of flood storage should not be credited simultaneously as wetland creation/restoration. Therefore, we recommend that the wetland creation numbers be updated in Appendix F and wetland creation (a suite of functions) should be separated from flood storage creation (benefiting one function at the expense of others) in the DSEIS's discussion of the mitigation package.

Water Resources

EPA has identified information gaps related to aquatic life, drinking water supplies, and groundwater assessment in the DSEIS that should be addressed in the FEIS, as follows:

Page 10-5, Deicing Salt, North Tributary to Canobie Lake and Dinsmore Brook

A revised mass-balance chloride analysis for both of these streams should be done based on the new configuration for Exit 3, which will incorporate significant changes in lane and ramp design. Wherever possible, the mass-balance model should incorporate past and existing field water-quality analyses for chloride for verification. For example, will future loadings from the new interchange and other salt sources always be less than the TMDL target limit for the Dinsmore Brook watershed of 126 tons/year, or will exceptions occur?

Page 10-5, Aquatic Life

For the sake of completeness, the FEIS should present the results of the September 2003 NHDES/EPA study of macroinvertebrate and fish benthic analyses in Porcupine and Policy Brooks, which designated a "Non-Support" status for aquatic life in both streams. Because of these results and numerous water-quality exceedances, these streams were included in NH's 303(d) list for chloride impairment. Similar studies should also be performed for the Tributary to Harris Brook, Dinsmore Brook, the Tributary to Wheeler Pond, Beaver Brook, Cohas Brook, and Little Cohas Brook in the reaches immediately downstream of I-93 crossings to evaluate base-line conditions of aquatic life prior to construction.

Page 10-6, Groundwater and Drinking Water

The DSEIS mentions three public water supplies: Yankee Trader TNC in Windham (EPAID#2548040), PEU W&E Wellfield CWS in Windham (EPAID#2542030) and Boumil Grove Condominiums CWS in Londonderry (EPAID#1392050) as among water supplies potentially receiving the greatest impact from sodium and chloride from I-93. (For example, the Boumil Grove bedrock well is only 100 feet from I-93S). The Plaza 93 wells no longer exist due to Exit 3 lane realignment. However, the DSEIS presents no up-to-date data for these inorganic contaminants in these drinking water sources. The FEIS should provide the existing NaCl concentrations and describe what the historical trends show.

For example, the NHDES drinking water program reports (personal communication, 9/11/09) chloride/sodium data for Yankee Trader on three dates from seven to twelve years ago, showing chloride levels above the 250 mg/l secondary standard on two occasions:

9/2/97 – Cl (360 mg/l); Na (123.2 mg/l)
7/13/99 – Cl (110 mg /l); Na (14.9 mg/l)
6/4/02 – Cl (307 mg /l); Na (106 mg/l)

Boumil Grove was apparently last sampled in August 2004 with Cl = 239 mg/l and Na at 87.2 mg/l, indicating elevated concentrations. To better evaluate present conditions, much more recent sample information is needed for this and the other drinking water supplies.

The DSEIS claims that modeling shows no chloride impacts to groundwater along the I-93 right of way, but does not present any onsite data to verify this assertion. Although numerous monitoring wells were installed along the ROW by NHDOT in 2006 as part of stormwater treatment site evaluations, no monitoring data from such wells are given to support claims of no impact. At a minimum, if no data are available, these wells should be sampled in the near future by NHDOT for Na and Cl and results sent to reviewing agencies. One monitoring well sampled by EPA in June 2004 along the I-93 ROW near Exit 2 had a chloride concentration of 318 mg/l, which exceeded the 250 mg/l secondary drinking water standard.

Pages 10-14 through 10-18, 10.4 Existing Conditions

This section of the DSEIS provides detail about TMDL development for the four impaired watersheds, in addition to chloride surveillance monitoring in other streams. However, existing conditions after mid-2007 to the present are not described. EPA recommends that more up-to-date monitoring results be presented in the FEIS. For example, the FEIS should provide information on what violations, if any, occurred during the winters of 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 in these watersheds; what the NHDOT deicing chemical loadings in tons per lane-mile were for I-93 during the last two winters; what the loadings were for state roads adjacent to I-93 that NHDOT treats; how these amounts compare with the estimated average (10-year) annual use in tons/year for Beaver Brook (949 tons/yr), Dinsmore Brook (139 tons/yr), and Policy Brook (676 tons/yr); how they compare with target reductions specified in the TMDLs.

Page 10-22, Mitigation, Water Resources

The DSEIS states that \$2.5 million has been dedicated to fund salt reduction activities in I-93 municipalities. We recommend that the FEIS provide more specific details regarding such projects funded to date, including how many grants have been awarded, and for what purpose, how long such funds will be available to towns, and what the grant conditions are for applicants.

Phosphorus Loadings, p. 5-6 (Section 2.2.1) in Appendix F

Cobbetts Pond is on the 2008 NH 303(d) list for dissolved oxygen saturation, a condition caused largely by nutrient loadings. The FEIS should indicate this impairment and address whether the project would contribute to this impairment. The DSEIS cites modeling results indicating that the Selected Alternative would increase phosphorus concentrations in Canobie Lake by 0.7 to 1.5 µg/l and in Cobbetts Pond by 0.6 to 1.6 µg/l. This represents a 5 to 15% increase above current phosphorus concentrations presented in the DSEIS, a significant increase. Recent data on BMP efficiencies (including data collected by the UNH Stormwater Center) indicates that detention basins (both wet and dry) do not typically achieve the 40% phosphorus removal assumed for some of the model runs cited above, so the actual increases in phosphorus concentrations are likely to be closer to the high ends of the ranges (which assumed only 20% BMP efficiency). These increases would not only contribute to the dissolved oxygen impairment in Cobbetts Pond, and likely exacerbate the “potentially not attaining” status of Canobie Lake with respect to dissolved oxygen saturation, but they would also cause both lakes to exceed the 12 µg/l total phosphorus criterion identified for mesotrophic lakes in the NHDES proposed Comprehensive Assessment and Listing Methodology, dated September 3, 2009. One way to address these concerns would be to revise the stormwater management approach (incorporating BMPs with higher phosphorus removal efficiencies) to ensure that applicable portions of the project do not contribute to the impairment of Cobbetts Pond and the potential impairment of Canobie lake. If the new stormwater planning work referenced in Appendix F, Section 2.4.2 addresses these concerns, this plan should be included in the FEIS, along with updated nutrient loading calculations.

Changes in Analytical Methods, p. 31 (Section 4.4.2) in Appendix F

This section references new wetlands impacts (in comparison to those reported in the 2004 FEIS) resulting in part from the increased size of some stormwater BMPs. The FEIS should explain whether the placement of these BMPs complies with the “Restrictions on Placing Stormwater Treatment Structures in Wetlands” section of the May 2007 NHDES *Interim Guidance for the Structural Design of Stormwater Best Management Practices Needed to Achieve Results of Pollutant Loading Analyses*, as referenced in Appendix F, Section 2.4.2, p. 12.

Indirect Effects

Basis for Build estimates

We are concerned about the validity of assuming that the routine population forecasts developed by the NH Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) represent the Build condition. The DSEIS indicates that OEP planners assumed that infrastructure, including sufficient highway capacity, would exist, but no further information is provided. The FEIS should discuss how doubling the size of one of the largest highways in the state was factored into the OEP forecasts, whether and how the forecasts accounted for induced growth, and if so, how much, and on what basis. The method by which OEP developed the Build forecasts, the assumptions they used, and how they estimated induced growth needs to be more fully explained to support the assertion. We recognize that population growth has slowed since the 2004 FEIS was produced, and that the Delphi panel’s numbers may overestimate growth in 2020 and 2030, but we believe that it is very likely that using OEP’s forecasts as the Build forecasts underestimates population growth, and therefore also the difference between Build and No Build and resulting indirect effects.

Intraregional development shifts

We concur that growth induced by a transportation improvement is likely to represent growth that is redistributed within a geographic region if the region is defined appropriately. All too often, however, the geographic region is defined as a small area in the immediate vicinity of the transportation improvement. As we understand it, Scenario 2 is based on the assumption that growth could be redistributed anywhere within the state of New Hampshire as well as portions of Massachusetts, Vermont, and Maine. We believe this is a sufficiently large area within which to look at the potential for induced growth.

I-93 Transit Investment Study

We are disappointed that implementation of the recommendations of the I-93 Transit Investment Study was not included in the analysis because it was not considered reasonably foreseeable. We believe this conclusion is premature, since the draft final report for the study was only recently distributed for comment. The Transit Investment Study calls for interim investment in Bus-on-Shoulder service, starting in the next few years in the southern portion of the bi-state corridor, with eventual rail service on the Manchester & Lawrence line. This service would relieve congestion on I-93 and provide transportation choices for New Hampshire and Massachusetts residents. We recommend that the updated information on the status of the recommendations from that study be incorporated into the analysis.

Delphi Panel

We firmly believe that the use of the Delphi panel in the 2004 FEIS produced credible forecasts of population and employment based on information available at that time. The 2009 DSEIS/Reevaluation states that the Delphi panel was less than successful because “the panelists could not reach consensus.” What really happened was that there was little investment of effort in trying to bring the panelists to consensus since that wasn’t considered necessary. As stated in NCHRP Report 8-36, *The Use of Expert Panels in Analyzing Transportation and Land Use Alternatives*,

[i]t is important to note that a lack of consensus from the panel does not signify a “failure” of the panel, but rather may accurately reflect a situation in which only a wide range of possible impacts can be foreseen; perhaps too many variables remain unknown or the panelists have defensible but different views.

Indeed, as indicated in the I-93 Manchester to Salem Expert Panel Analysis Final Report prepared for NH DOT, when discussing the Blended Average Allocation:

[t]he panel preferred to say that they have “informed opinions” which cross a broad spectrum. The idea of having a single number to summarize their work is something of an artificial device in order to provide another measure by which to consider the findings and to assess the implication relative to secondary impacts.

Second, we believe the Delphi analysis should not be faulted for using information that was available at the time (2001). The panelists used the most recent information available on population and job growth and could not have known that growth would slow, exacerbated by the recent economic crisis. We also note that had a gravity model been developed at the time, it too would have been based on higher growth rates.

Third, we disagree that it would have been sensible to set an artificial cap on the total amount of population or employment growth the panelists could allocate. By not setting a cap, the panelists were free to consider whether people or employers from *outside* the 29-town study area might choose to relocate *into* the area because of the transportation improvements. In other words, the 29-town area was the region that was expected to experience induced growth, but it was not assumed to comprise the entire ‘sending area’ from which induced growth might originate. In fact, as described above, Scenario 2 similarly did not assume that all the induced growth originated within the 29-town area; instead, growth could be redistributed *from* anywhere in the entire state of New Hampshire as well as parts of Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont *into* the 29-town area.

We agree, however, that transportation is just one component in determining where people choose to live and where employers choose to locate, and that transportation may not even be the most important component. Indeed, that is precisely why we believe the Delphi approach has significant advantages over the simple gravity model used to construct Scenario 2. The panelists considered other important factors in their forecasts,

such as market demand, environmental constraints, economic feasibility, and the regulatory environment. Such factors would be too complicated to include in a model, but these and other factors did underlay the thought processes used by the Delphi panel, and are therefore included in Scenario 1. We believe a Delphi approach is more likely to accurately predict the future than a one-dimensional approach based solely on the accessibility of transportation infrastructure, if both are operating with the same information. That is not the case here, of course, since the Delphi panel used information available in 2001.

Cumulative Impacts

It is not clear whether the cumulative impacts analysis specifically includes all aspects of the proposed I-93 Tri-Town Interchange (formerly Lowell Junction) project, or whether only the widening to four lanes is included. Activities in Massachusetts have progressed since publication of the study by Merrimack Valley Planning Commission. An EIS process for the I-93 Tri-Town Interchange project was launched earlier this year by Mass Highway, the Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development, and FHWA. The proposed I-93 Tri-Town Interchange project should be explicitly addressed in the FEIS since it is so closely linked geographically to this project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Section 5.3.7 of the DSEIS states that, “It is not useful or informative at this point to consider greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as part of the I-93 DSEIS.” The DSEIS goes on to characterize climate change as a global issue and “climate change does not easily lend itself to an analysis at a local level.” We believe the decision by FHWA and NHDOT not to do a GHG analysis for this project in the reevaluation is problematic. Had there been a scoping process and coordination with EPA, we would have asked for the analysis to be done and worked with the lead agencies to identify the appropriate methods for the analysis. For the past several years, during scoping for a wide range of projects, EPA has routinely commented on the need to characterize the potential for the project to result in GHG emissions (and to compare those emissions to the No Action scenario) and to discuss potential mitigation strategies related to those emissions. The DSEIS correctly states that there is no national GHG standard but the statement that “nothing in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) law explicitly requires an analysis of greenhouse gases at the project level...” misses the mark. We recognize that the characterization of GHG emissions as part of the NEPA process is a developing area, but also that it is an important one for large transportation projects that could result in increased VMT given that transportation sector emissions in the U.S. are second only to electricity power generation as a percentage of GHG emissions, as noted on the U.S. Department of Transportation Transportation and Climate Change Clearinghouse website (<http://climate.dot.gov/about/index.html>). This website provides a helpful discussion on GHG emissions related to transportation and includes links to tools that can be used to characterize project emissions. In addition, the State of New Hampshire established a Climate Change Policy Task Force which enacted a Climate Action Plan in March 2009. That plan includes a state goal of reducing GHG emissions by 80% by 2050, and one of the major strategies in the plan for achieving that goal is the reduction in VMT.

Therefore, we believe it is wholly appropriate and relevant for the FEIS to characterize GHG emissions from the project and to explain those emissions in the context of NH climate policies and to discuss whether and how the highway widening (and other components of the project) will be consistent with those policies. We are willing to work with NHDOT/FHWA to help develop appropriate approaches to the GHG analysis.

Air Quality

Section 5.2.3 of the SDEIS (page 5-6) notes that “NHDOT will require the contractors involved with the reconstruction of I-93, to include air pollution control devices on heavy diesel construction equipment in accordance with applicable state and federal laws at the time of construction. The merits and practicality of more stringent or voluntary specification measures will be considered through the final design process and in consultation with the contracting community and NHDES.” We support this action and request that NHDOT and FHWA commit in the FEIS and Record of Decision to formalize this requirement through contract specifications requiring construction vehicles and equipment to include retrofit control equipment (oxidation catalysts or particulate filters installed on the exhaust of the diesel engine). The Northeast Diesel Collaborative has prepared model construction specifications which NHDOT could use as it develops contract specifications. The model construction specifications can be found on the Northeast Diesel Collaborative web site at <http://northeastdiesel.org/pdf/NEDC-Construction-Contract-Spec.pdf>. Massachusetts and Connecticut are already using contract specifications to require construction equipment to be retrofitted with control devices and use clean fuels in order to reduce diesel emissions.

Project Coordination

From a process standpoint we note that even though scoping was not technically required for the preparation of the DSEIS/Reevaluation, we believe that a scoping process and coordination with EPA and other agencies would have been advisable in this instance given the increase in wetland impacts, changes to wetland/water quality mitigation, the need for a greenhouse gas emission analysis in the EIS, and relevant questions regarding the alternatives analysis based on downgraded growth projections for the region since publication of the FEIS.